UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,378	01/07/2002	Jae Ho Jung	LT-0010	5573

34610   7590   10/08/2008
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP
P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

EXAMINER
BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 July 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21,23-25,27-35 and 37</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21,23-25,27-35 and 37</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 07/02/08.

2.   Claims 1-21 and 23-25, 27-35, and 37 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 13, 18, 25, and

33, are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 1 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention. It is unclear to which entered data the phrase, "converting the entered data" relates

as user input has been entered in both the input screen and the input window. Similarly, it is

unclear whether or not that user entered prescribed identifier of Claim 13 is supposed to be

converted and stored in combination with the other user entered data in the second application

database. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-12 and 18-21, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Flanagin et al (US-6,272,545 08/07/01) in view of Ellard (US-5,999,937 12/07/99) in

further view of Schlack et al (US-5,392,447 02/21/95).

        -In regard to independent claims 1 and 18, Flanagin teaches a method or storing data

in a personal information terminal, comprising:

        an input/output interface (Fig. 3) configured to receive commands from a user and

display information (column 6, lines 25-45), the input/output interface to enter data associated

with a first application program (column 6, lines 25-45)(Fig. 3) associated with the first

application program (e.g. through one of the interfaces of the "application programs 5A-5C" on

the PDA);

        composing data in a first APP (column 2, lines 63-65; column 13, lines 25-32) of a

plurality of APPs (column 2, lines 63-65; column 13, lines 25-32) embedded in the personal

information terminal (column 13, line 21: "PIM 5A")(Fig. 1), the data being in a first format

(column 11, lines 60-67; column 12, lines 1-14; column 13, lines 25-32: "A predefined set of

properties is supported for each object type");

        wherein each of the plurality of application programs were selectively initiated and

executed in the personal information terminal (column 2, lines 62-65; column 11, lines 57-66;

column 13, lines 25-32),

        wherein the first application program was a document editing program ("electronic email

messages" or "communications" or "word processing") and the second APP was one of a

calendar application ("appointments" or "scheduling") or "tasks" application (column 1, lines

36-38; column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32);

wherein contents of the first data format entered in the first application program in the PDA are stored as re-formatted data of the second data format in the second database in the PDA to match the second database to the first database while the first application program was executed (column 12, lines 19-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. Flanagin teaches automatically updating data between two different databases when the two databases are connected as well as teaches always maintaining a connection between the two different databases).

Flanagin does not specifically teach selecting a conversion of the entered data in a format of the composed data from the first format to a second format suitable for a second application program of the plurality of APPs using a conversion program; and storing the format-converted data in a database associated with the second APP, the conversion program was initiated and executed on the PIM, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any of any other of the plurality of application programs. Ellard teaches a data exchange system computer system including a first and second database (column 2, lines 29-33: "system transfers data between one or more input data sets...and one or more output data sets")(Fig. 1) as well as conversion routines (Fig. 3) for converting from the first data format of the first database (column 2, lines 29-33: "input data sets...having different data formats") to the second different format (column 2, lines 29-33: "output data sets...have a different data format") of the data set for data being transferred to the second data set (column 3, lines 36-54). Ellard also teaches conversion programs capable of converting data from any one of a plurality of data types into a format of any other data type (column 2, lines 28-42: "configuration data to convert and transfer any type of data into any

other type of data"). Ellard further teaches wherein the conversion program was executed on by

the computer system (i.e. equivalent to PIM)(column 3, lines 37-48: "data exchange system may

be a software application being executed by a computer system"; column 5, lines 6-20). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of

Flanagin have been executed a conversion program capable of converting data from any one of

the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application,

because Ellard teaches that by being able to automatically convert any format to any other format

a user would be spared the significant amount of time necessary to write a custom software

application to transfer and convert data between different data sets (column 1, lines 23-26).

Ellard also taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the

integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity….entry

errors"). This process would have benefited Flanagin which had a desire that at least some of the

objects on the application data stores be either copied or transferred to other stores in order that

the user can access the same information. In this way the user of Flanagin would have been able

to access related or similar information across a plurality of executing application programs.

Flanagin also does not teach providing an information input window for entering format-

matched data for the second APP. Ellard teaches providing an information input window for

entering format-matched data for the second APP and assigning data entered through the

information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP (column 7, lines 7-63:

"input data gathered by reviewing data from the input data…formats of the data records and

fields determined…analyze the input data to determine what conversions are required"; column

8, lines 26-32: e.g. "member's birthday" date format). It would have been obvious to one or

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have provided an

information input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP; and assigning

data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second

APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would

increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30:

"integrity....entry errors").

     Neither Flanagin nor Ellard teach wherein the different application programs had specific

input screens inputting user data. Schlack et al taught a user interface window for entering data

for a plurality of different application programs on a PDA (Figs. 6-17). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the user interface of

Flanagin to have provided separate display windows for entering data for the respective

application programs as shown in Schlack et al, because Schlack et al taught that by entering

data into an application program via an in input window on a PDA said entered data could be

converted and mapped to other application programs on the PDA thereby decreasing the number

of key strokes required and the probability that a data entry error will occur (column 1, lines 55-

66; column 2, lines 45-53; column 8, lines 55-63).

     -In regard to dependent claims 2-3, and 20, Flanagin teaches wherein the data format

(column 13, lines 25-32: "each object type") of each APP program (column 13, lines 25-32:

"appointments", "tasks", email, etc.) was different from a data format of the other APPs (column

13, lines 25-32: "predefined set of properties is supported for each object type" and "distinct")

and wherein each APP had an associated database to store data composed in the corresponding

APP (column 13, lines 25-32: "distinct database"). Flanagin also teaches wherein database fields

where utilized to store data (column 12, line 3: "plurality of fields"). Flanagin does not

specifically teach utilizing a delimiter between portions of data in the data block to indicate a

new field. The Examiner notes that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time

of the invention for delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the

benefit of separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record (Note: Ellard

Reference).

     -In regard to dependent claims 4, and 23, Flanagin teaches wherein the PIM had a

plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32) wherein the first APP was a document

editing program ("electronic email messages") and the second APP was one of a calendar

application ("appointments") or "tasks" application, and wherein the first and second databases

are matched without data entry into the second application program (Flanagin: column 12, lines

22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. via the synchronization manager)(Ellard: column 7,

lines 7-31)(Fig. 4).

     -In regard to dependent claim 5, Flanagin teaches composing data in the first APP

(column 13, lines 25-32).

     Flanagin does not teach selecting a second APP in which to store the composed data.

Ellard teaches selecting a second APP in which to store the composed data (column 2, lines 27-

65)(Figs 2 &4). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and

stored as data in a selected second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data

between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors

(column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity....entry errors").

       -In regard to dependent claims 6, 19, and 21, Flanagin does not teach providing an

information input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP; and assigning

data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second

APP, wherein the input window includes sub-windows. Ellard teaches providing an information

input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP and assigning data entered

through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP (column

7, lines 7-63: "input data gathered by reviewing data from the input data…formats of the data

records and fields determined…analyze the input data to determine what conversions are

required"; column 8, lines 26-32: e.g. "member's birthday" date format). It would have been

obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to

have provided an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second

APP; and assigning data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data

field of the second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two

formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-

30: "integrity....entry errors").

       -In regard to dependent claims 7 and 24, Flanagin teaches composing data in the first

APP (column 13, lines 25-32).

Flanagin does not teach selecting a data block in the composed data and choosing the second APP in which to store the data of the selected block. Ellard teaches selecting a data block in the composed data and choosing the second APP in which to store the data of the selected block (column 4, lines 13-34; column 7, lines 7-31). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and stored as data in a second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity….entry errors").

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Flanagin does not teach wherein a written order of words or phrases constituting the data in the data block was matched with a data field order of the database associated with the second APP. Ellard teaches wherein a written order of words or phrases constituting the data in the data block was matched with a data field order of the database associated with the second APP (column 7, lines 63-67; column 8, lines 1-32: "data field of the input data set may be converted into the output database format and then inserted into the data field in the output data base"). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed a written order of words or phrases constituting the data in the data block was matched with a data field order of the database associated with the second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity….entry errors").

   -In regard to dependent claim 9, Flanagin teaches database objects containing records

of data for distinct APPs (column 13, lines 25-32). Flanagin also teaches wherein database fields

where utilized to store data (column 12, line 3: "plurality of fields"). Flanagin does not

specifically teach wherein a delimiter between portions of data in the data block indicate a new

field. The Examiner notes that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time of

the invention for delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the

benefit of separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record.

   -In regard to dependent claim 10, Flanagin does not teach wherein a beginning of the

data block includes an identifier code to identify the second APP in which to store the data.

Ellard teaches wherein a beginning of the data block includes an identifier code to identify the

second APP in which to store the data (column 7, lines 63-67; column 8, lines 1-32: "code that

identifies…number…uniquely identifies"). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have a beginning of the data

block includes an identifier code to identify the second APP in which to store the data, because

Ellard taught that being able to identify where the input data set was going to be converted, the

user could convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by

minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity….entry errors").

   -In regard to dependent claims 11 and 12 , Flanagin does not teach wherein the

composed data comprises a specific data item to indicate the second APP to which composed

data is to be stored, and wherein converting the format of the composed data converts the format

of the composed data to the format specific in the second APP, based on the specific data item in

the composed data, wherein the specific data item was initially fixed according to a prescribed

rule, and wherein the specific data item was changeable by a user. Ellard teaches wherein the

composed data comprises a specific data item to indicate the second APP to which composed

data is to be stored (column 7, lines 6-31 & 58-67; column 8, lines 1-35), and wherein converting

the format of the composed data converts the format of the composed data to the format specific

in the second APP based on the specific data item in the composed data (column 8, lines 26-35:

"converted into the output database format"), wherein the specific data item was initially fixed

according to a prescribed rule (column 2, lines 35-40: "standard conversion routines"), and

wherein the specific data item was changeable by a user (column 2, lines 35-40: "customized

conversion routines…by the operator of the system"). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have included an

identifier code of the second APP, because Ellard teaches without the identification code, there

would be no way to determine the identity of the output data set and the corresponding output

data format.

7.   Claims 13-17, 25, 27-35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Flanagin et al (US-6,272,545 08/07/01) in view of Crozier (US-5,392,390

02/21/95) of Ellard (US-5,999,937 12/07/99).

        -In regard to independent claim 13, Flanagin teaches composing data in a first one of a

plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32), wherein each of the plurality of

application programs was selectively operated in the personal information terminal (column 2, lines 62-65; column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32).

Flanagin further teaches wherein operating the first application program using a first procedure to enter data in the first application program (column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32) and operating the first application program using a second procedure to enter data in the first application and the second application program database (column 12, lines 19-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28).

Flanagin does not teach entering a prescribed identifier code being indicative of a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the composed data is to be stored; selecting the second APP based on the ID code using a table to match prescribed ID codes; converting a first format to a second format; and storing the data in a database associated with the second APP. Crozier teaches having a prescribed identifier code being indicative of a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the composed data is to be stored (column 3, lines 56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56: "DT Application specifies the…application name"); selecting the second APP based on the ID code using a table to match prescribed ID codes (column 3, lines 56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56); converting a first format to a second format (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3, lines 56-66); and storing the data in a database associated with the second APP (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3, lines 56-66). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and stored as data in a second APP, because Crozier teaches that doing so would allow translating

data between a wide variety of applications while ensuring that the data need only be entered

once (column 3, lines 27-30).

Flanagan also does not teach wherein the conversion program was initiated and executed

on the personal information terminal, the conversion program capable of converting data from

any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of

applications. Ellard teaches a data exchange system computer system including a first and

second database as well as conversion routines for converting from the first data format of the

database to the second different format of the data set for data being transferred to the second

data set (column 3, lines 36-54). Ellard also teaches conversion programs capable of converting

data from any one of a plurality of data types into a format of any other data type (column 2,

lines 28-42: "configuration data to convert and transfer any type of data into any other type of

data"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

for the PIM of Flanagin have been capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of

application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application, because Ellard

teaches that by being able to automatically convert any format to any other format a user would

be spared the significant amount of time necessary to write a custom software application to

transfer and convert data between different data sets (column 1, lines 23-26). Ellard also taught

that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data

by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity….entry errors").

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Crozier teaches wherein the prescribed identifier

code specifies a data section including a part of the composed data (column 8, lines 40-65: "HH

Field Name"), and wherein converting the format of the composted data converts the data in the specified data section to the second format (column 3, 9-15: "mapping and translating the data to the formats expected by a second computer application"). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and stored as data in a second APP, because Crozier teaches that doing so would allow translating data between a wide variety of applications while ensuring that the data need only be entered once (column 3, lines 27-30).

   -**In regard to dependent claims 15-16,** Flanagin teaches wherein the data format (column 13, lines 25-32: "each object type") of each APP program (column 13, lines 25-32: "appointments", "tasks", email, etc.) was different from a data format of the other APPs (column 13, lines 25-32: "predefined set of properties is supported for each object type" and "distinct") and wherein each APP had an associated database to store data composed in the corresponding APP (column 13, lines 25-32: "distinct database"). Flanagin also teaches wherein database fields where utilized to store data (column 12, line 3: "plurality of fields"). Flanagin does not specifically teach utilizing a delimiter between portions of data in the data block to indicate a new field. The Examiner notes that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time of the invention for delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the benefit of separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record (Note: Ellard Reference).

-**In regard to dependent claim 17,** Flanagin teaches wherein the PIM had a plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32) wherein the first APP was a document editing program ("electronic email messages") and the second APP was one of a calendar application ("appointments") or "tasks" application, and wherein the first and second databases are matched without data entry into the second application program (Flanagin: column 12, lines 22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. via the synchronization manager)(Ellard: column 7, lines 7-31)(Fig. 4).

-**In regard to independent claims 25 and 33**, Flanagin teaches a method or storing data in a PDA, comprising:

an input/output interface (Fig. 3) configured to receive commands and display information (column 6, lines 25-45), the input output interface to enter data associated with a first application program based on input of a user (column 6, lines 25-45)(Fig. 3);

a central processing unit configured to receive and process commands entered into the PDA (column 6, lines 25-45: "PDA");

a memory of the PDA configured to accommodate a plurality of databases (column 13, lines 25-32: "different databases") associated with a plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32: "appointments", "tasks", etc), the plurality of databases provided in the PDA (column 13, lines 21-39)(Fig. 1: 5A-5C) wherein a first APP stored on the PIM is configured to receive and store data in a first database using a first format and a second APP on the PDA configured to receive an store data in a second database using a second format (column 13, lines 25-32: "A predefined set of properties is supported for each object type").

Flanagin also teaches wherein contents of the first data format entered in the first application program in the PDA are stored as re-formatted data of the second data format in the second database in a PDA to match the second database to the first database while the first application program was executed (column 12, lines 22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. Flanagin teaches automatically updating data between two different databases when the two databases are connected as well as teaches always maintaining a connection between the two different databases).

Flanagan does not teach a conversion program to receive data in a first format, reformat the received data to the second format, and store the reformatted data in a second database. Flanagan also does not teach wherein the first application program, the conversion program conversion program was initiated and executed on the personal information terminal, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application. Ellard teaches a data exchange system computer system including a first and second database as well as conversion routines for converting from the first data format of the database to the second different format of the data set for data being transferred to the second data set (column 3, lines 36-54). Ellard also teaches conversion programs capable of converting data from any one of a plurality of data types into a format of any other data type (column 2, lines 28-42: "configuration data to convert and transfer any type of data into any other type of data"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin have been capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application, because Ellard teaches that by being able to automatically convert

any format to any other format a user would be spared the significant amount of time necessary

to write a custom software application to transfer and convert data between different data sets

(column 1, lines 23-26). Ellard also taught that being able to convert data between any two

formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-

30: "integrity....entry errors").

     Flanagin does not teach having a prescribed identifier marker being indicative of a

second one of the plurality of application programs into which the composed data is to be stored;

selecting the second APP based on the ID code using a table to match prescribed ID codes;

converting a first format to a second format; and storing the data in a database associated with

the second APP. Crozier teaches having a prescribed identifier code being indicative of a second

one of the plurality of application programs into which the composed data is to be stored

(column 3, lines 56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56: "DT Application specifies

the...application name"); selecting the second APP based on the ID code using a table to match

prescribed ID codes (column 3, lines 56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56);

converting a first format to a second format (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3, lines 56-66); and

storing the data in a database associated with the second APP (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3,

lines 56-66). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and

stored as data in a second APP, because Crozier teaches that doing so would allow translating

data between a wide variety of applications while ensuring that the data need only be entered

once (column 3, lines 27-30).

-In regard to dependent claims 31 and 32, Flanagin teaches wherein the input/output interface comprises a touch screen (column 6, lines 25-45)(Fig. 3). Flanagin does not teach automatic conversion of data by determining an application program into which the data was to be stored and determining the individual data fields within the data, wherein prescribed portions of the data to be converted contain identification markers to indicate the APP into which the data was to be stored and wherein delimiters in the data indicate a beginning of at least one data field. Ellard teaches automatic conversion of data by determining an application program into which the data was to be stored and determining the individual data fields within the data, wherein prescribed portions of the data to be converted contain identification markers to indicate the APP into which the data was to be stored and wherein delimiters in the data indicate a beginning of at least one data field (column 1, lines 29-31; column 2, lines 27-60; column 7, lines 7-31 & 63-67; column 8, lines 1-35). It would have been obvious for Flannigan to have incorporated said features of Ellard for the same rational as given above. Wherein Flanagin does not specifically teach delimiters between portions of data in the data block to indicate a new field, the Examiner notes that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time of the invention for delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the benefit of separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record.

-In regard to dependent claims 27 and 34, Flanagin teaches wherein the PIM had a plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32) wherein the first APP was a document editing program ("electronic email messages") and the second APP was one of a calendar application ("appointments") or "tasks" application, and wherein the first and second databases

are matched without data entry into the second application program (Flanagin: column 12, lines

22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. via the synchronization manager)(Ellard: column 7,

lines 7-31)(Fig. 4).

       -In regard to dependent claim 28, Flanagin does not teach wherein the conversion

program performs one of a manual and automatic conversion of data. Ellard teaches wherein the

conversion program performs one of a manual and automatic conversion of data (column 7, lines

7-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for Flanagin to have utilized

a manual or automatic conversion program, because Ellard teaches that both methods provide a

user-intuitive method for converting and storing data into a different format (column 1, lines 26-

30: "integrity….entry errors").

       -In regard to dependent claims 29-30, Flanagin does not teach providing an

information input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP; and assigning

data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second

APP, wherein the input window includes sub-windows. Ellard teaches providing an information

input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP and assigning data entered

through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP (column

7, lines 7-63: "input data gathered by reviewing data from the input data…formats of the data

records and fields determined…analyze the input data to determine what conversions are

required"; column 8, lines 26-32: e.g. "member's birthday" date format). It would have been

obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to

have provided an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second

APP; and assigning data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data

field of the second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two

formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-

30: "integrity….entry errors").

    -In regard to dependent claim 35, Flanagin does not teach wherein the conversion

program performs one of a manual and automatic conversion of data. Ellard teaches wherein the

conversion program performs one of a manual and automatic conversion of data (column 7, lines

7-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for Flanagin to have utilized

a manual or automatic conversion program, because Ellard teaches that both methods provide a

user-intuitive method for converting and storing data into a different format (column 1, lines 26-

30: "integrity….entry errors").

    -In regard to dependent claim 37, Flanagin teaches wherein each of the first and second

application programs are operated in the personal information terminal (Fig. 1: 5A, 5B, 5C) to

respectively display data stored in the first and second application programs (column 11, lines

57-66; column 13, lines 27-32).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the independent claims have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

        -In regard to independent claim 1, the Applicant argued that neither of cited references

taught the necessary input screens for the respective application programs, whereby data for said

application programs could be entered. The newly cited Schlack et al reference is believed to

teach said features.

        In general, the Examiner does not find the Applicant's arguments persuasive with regards

to all the elements of the system residing on the PDA. While the synchronization of the distinct

databases in Flanagin does occur between the mobile and desktop devices, the Ellard reference

clearly teaches a contained system for converting and synchronizing any two data sets. The

motivation for such a synchronization of the plurality of distinct databases on an individual PDA

of Flanagin would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention.

        -In regard to independent claims 13, 25, 33, Applicant argues that Crozier does not teach

or suggest the newly added limitations wherein the entered data associated with the first

application program included data of a prescribed identifier code/identification marker. Said

marker utilized to identify the second application program. The Examiner respectfully disagrees

with the Applicant. Crozier teaches that the user could select (i.e. enter "associated" data) the

appropriate mapping between application programs. The mapping specifying the corresponding

application names and the corresponding format types of said applications. (column 3, lines 56-

66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56: "DT Application specifies the…application name")(Figs. 9 & 10).

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Please note the additionally cited references on the accompanying PTO-892 Form.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121.
The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178